

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of JESSICA WILLIAMS, MICHAEL  
WILLIAMS, KAYLYN WILLIAMS, THOMAS  
WILLIAMS, and CHRISTI LOUISE WILLIAMS,  
Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LINDA WILLIAMS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MICHAEL WILLIAMS,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of JESSICA WILLIAMS, MICHAEL  
WILLIAMS, KAYLYN WILLIAMS, THOMAS  
WILLIAMS, and CHRISTI LOUISE WILLIAMS,  
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MICHAEL WILLIAMS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

UNPUBLISHED  
February 22, 2005

No. 256661  
Muskegon Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 02-030967-NA

No. 256858  
Muskegon Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 02-030967-NA

LINDA WILLIAMS,

Respondent.

---

Before: Schuette, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Bandstra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right the trial court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that a statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) provides that a trial court may terminate a parent's parental rights to a child if it finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that "[t]he parent, without regard to intent, fails to provide proper care or custody for the child and there is no reasonable expectation that the parent will be able to provide proper care and custody within a reasonable time considering the child's age." Here, there was no evidence that respondents were capable of maintaining a safe and stable home for the children. At the time of the termination hearing, respondents were living in a two-bedroom home with two other adults and admitted that they did not have adequate space to accommodate their children. Even when provided with assistance, respondents were unable to maintain employment or housing, which led to numerous evictions and homelessness for them and their children. They also failed to provide needed medical and dental care for the children when the children were in their custody, despite having Medicaid to cover the cost of care, and did not regularly visit the children when the children were in the temporary custody of the court and living with the paternal grandparents and a paternal aunt.

For these same reasons, the record does not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

We affirm.

/s/ Bill Schuette  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Richard A. Bandstra